Interview Summary	10/551,537	VONDRACEK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JIE YANG	1793	
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PT	O personnel):		
1) <u>JIE YANG</u> .	(3) Gary R. Edwards.		
2)	(4)		
Date of Interview: 31 March 2010.			
Type: a)☐ Telephonic b)☐ Video Conference c)☒ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant	2)⊠ applicant's repr	esentative]	
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description:	e)⊠ No.		
Claim(s) discussed: <u>14 and 26</u> .			
Identification of prior art discussed: <u>US'226 and NPL-1</u> .			
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached.	g) was not reached	d. h)∐ N/A.	
reached, or any other comments: The Applicant presents Examiner agrees that the additional structure limitations, decreasing from the marginal zone toward the core regio writing the objected claim 14, which is now allowable. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amenallowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached. THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE NTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGENTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INFILLE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTITIONER OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTITIONER OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTITIONER OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE S	for example, with a prince is not taught in the research the example of the amendments which the example of the amendments with the example of the amendments of the amendments of the last Office action has R OF ONE MONTH OUTERVIEW SUMMARY	ecorded prior arts. The Aminer agreed would reneate that would render the UDE THE SUBSTANCE as already been filed, APR THIRTY DAYS FROM Y FORM, WHICHEVER I	der the claims e claims OF THE PLICANT IS THIS S LATER, TO
	/JieYang/		

Application No.

Applicant(s)